

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-13 are now pending in the application. By this paper, Claims 1, 2, 10, and 13 have been amended and Claims 14-18 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. The basis for these amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings originally filed. No new matter has been added. The preceding amendments and the following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

The Examiner states that U.S. Patent No. 6,120,855, filed in an Information Disclosure Statement on April 14, 2005, was not considered. Applicants note that subsequent to filing the Information Disclosure Statement of April 14, 2005, U.S. Patent No. 6,120,855 was withdrawn prior to issuing as a U.S. patent.

The Examiner also notes that there is a missing "Information Disclosure Statement" in the papers filed on June 24, 2004. Applicants assume the Examiner is referring to a missing PTO-1449 Form, and respectfully submit that a PTO-1449 Form was not required as the Information Disclosure Statement of June 24, 2004 was only filed to cross-reference related applications.

### **CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

Applicants have amended Claims 2, 10, and 13 as required by the Examiner. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 10 is not of “improper dependent form” as Claim 10 is an independent claim that is not “identical” to independent Claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3, 5, 10 and 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Egawa (U.S. Pat. No. 6,229,215).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 calls for a semiconductor device including a first semiconductor package in which a first semiconductor chip is mounted and a second semiconductor package in which at least one semiconductor chip is mounted and is supported on the first semiconductor package such that ends of the second semiconductor package are arranged above the first semiconductor chip. Similarly, independent Claim 10 calls for a semiconductor device including a first semiconductor package in which a first semiconductor chip is mounted and a second semiconductor chip that is supported on the first semiconductor package such that ends of the second semiconductor chip are arranged above the first semiconductor chip.

Independent Claim 12 calls for an electronic device including a first package in which an electronic component is mounted and a second package that is supported on the first package such that ends of the second package are arranged above the electronic component. Similarly, independent Claim 13 calls for electronic equipment

including a first semiconductor package in which a semiconductor chip is mounted, a second semiconductor package that is supported on the first semiconductor package such that ends of the second semiconductor package are arranged above the semiconductor chip, and a motherboard on which the second semiconductor package is mounted.

Egawa fails to teach a semiconductor chip mounted on a first semiconductor package or a second semiconductor package including a second semiconductor chip. The Examiner contends that Egawa teaches a first semiconductor package (17) in which a first semiconductor chip is mounted and a second semiconductor package (30) that is supported on the first semiconductor package such that ends of the second semiconductor package are arranged above the first semiconductor chip. See Office Action mailed October 5, 2005 at pg. 4.

Egawa teaches a semiconductor device (1) including a semiconductor chip (17) positioned below an internal substrate (30). See Egawa at Col. 4, Ins. 65-67, Col. 5, Ins. 1-8, and FIG. 7. Egawa does not disclose that the internal substrate is a "semiconductor package" or that a semiconductor chip is associated with the internal substrate. See Egawa at Col. 4, In. 67 and Col. 5, In. 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the "internal substrate" of Egawa is not a semiconductor package.

Applicants also respectfully submit that Egawa fails to teach a semiconductor chip mounted on the first semiconductor package (17). Reference number (17) simply denotes a semiconductor chip and does not disclose mounting the semiconductor chip

to a first semiconductor package. The first semiconductor chip is essentially a stand alone chip and is not associated with a semiconductor package.

Because Egawa fails to teach a semiconductor chip mounted on a first semiconductor package, and further, because Egawa fails to teach a second semiconductor package including a second semiconductor chip, Applicants respectfully submit that Egawa fails to teach each and every element of the present invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 10, 12, and 13, as well as Claims 2-9 and 11, respectively dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Examiner states that claims 4, 6-9 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have not amended the claims to include the allowable subject matter outlined by the Examiner and respectfully submit that the claims are allowable over the art of record in their present form in light of the foregoing remarks.


#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt

and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 29, 2005

By:   
G. Gregory Schivley  
Reg. No. 27,382  
Bryant E. Wade  
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

GGG/BEW/MHS